IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Alfred A. McCandies, #23294-057,) C.A. #4:08-3108-PMD
Petitioner,)
vs.) ORDER
Federal Bureau of Prisons; John LaManna, Warden of FCI Edgefield,)))
Respondents.)

This matter is before the court upon the magistrate judge's recommendation that the within action be dismissed. Because petitioner is <u>pro se</u>, this matter was referred to the magistrate judge.¹

This Court is charged with conducting a <u>de novo</u> review of any portion of the magistrate judge's report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, absent prompt objection by a dissatisfied party, it appears that Congress did not intend for the district court to review the factual and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge. <u>Thomas v Arn</u>, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Additionally, any party who fails to file timely, written objections to the magistrate judge's report pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) waives the right to raise those objections at the appellate court level. United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).² No objections have been filed

¹Pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 United States Code, § 636(b)(1)(B), and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2), D.S.C., the magistrate judge is authorized to review all pretrial matters and submit findings and recommendations to this Court.

²In <u>Wright v. Collins</u>, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985), the court held "that a <u>pro se</u> litigant must receive fair notification of the <u>consequences</u> of failure to object to a magistrate judge's report before such a procedural default will result in waiver of the right to appeal. The notice must be 'sufficiently understandable to one in appellant's circumstances fairly to appraise him of what is required." <u>Id.</u> at 846. Plaintiff was advised in a clear manner that his objections had to be filed within ten (10) days,

4:08-cv-03108-PMD Date Filed 02/24/09 Entry Number 17 Page 2 of 3

to the magistrate judge's report. Moreover, the report and recommendation sent to petitioner was

returned with a notation on the envelope stating "FORWARD TIME EXPIRED - RETURN TO

SENDER" and no change of address had been given as directed by the court.³

A review of the record indicates that the magistrate judge's report accurately summarizes this

case and the applicable law. Finding no error in the report, this court adopts the report and

recommendation and incorporates it into this order.

For the reasons articulated by the magistrate judge, it is hereby **ordered** that the within

action be **dismissed with prejudice** pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure

for lack of prosecution.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

PATRICK MICHAEL DUF

United States District Judge

February 24, 2009 Charleston, South Carolina

and he received notice of the <u>consequences</u> at the appellate level of his failure to object to the magistrate judge's report.

³By order dated October 6, 2008, petitioner was advised to keep the court advised in writing of any change of address.

2

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Petitioner is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this Order within **thirty (30) days** from the date hereof pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.